

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/764,754	01/26/2004	Jan Willem Hellenthal	W. Hellenthal 1-2 (LCNT/I	8766	
46363 PATTERSON	7590 02/08/2008 & SHERIDAN, LLP/		EXAMINER		
LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC 595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE			NGUYEN, VAN H		
SHREWSBUR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		2194 .		
•		• 1	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/08/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/764,754	HELLENTHAL ET AL.			
Examiner	Art Unit			
VAN H. NGUYEN	2194			

	Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
		VAN H. NGUYEN	2194					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE	REPLY FILED 22 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. 🗌	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.						
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
2. [The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
AME	NDMENTS	·	` '					
3. 🛛	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause				
	(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in bet	• 1	ducina or simplifyina	the issues for				
	appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially re	adding or simplifying					
•	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: see the attachment. (See 37 CFR 1.116 a		ected claims.	• •				
1. 🗀	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	PTOL-324).				
5. 🗀	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
3	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. 🛛	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
	Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .	•						
	Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 17-19</u> .			•				
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 17-15</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			·				
<u> AFFI</u>	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
3. 🔲	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	at before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and				
9. 🔲	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a				
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
	<u>UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:				
I2. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) I3. ☐ Other:								
	<u>-</u>							
	•							

Application/Control Number:

10/764,754 Art Unit: 2194

- The added limitations to the claims were not claimed in combination with these claims
 previously, the amendment is presenting claims of new/different scopes and would
 require further consideration and/or search.
- 2. As to independent claim 1: Applicant argued in sustance that Bouret does not teach "wherein said proxy processes global contract information to determine local contract service term for each of the open API servers and sends associated service contract implementation parameters to each of said open API servers based on said respective local contract service terms".

In response, the added limitations to the claims were not claimed in combination with the claim previously, the amendment is presenting claim of new/different scope and would require further consideration and/or search.

3. As to independent claim 17: Applicant argued in sustance that "the cited portion of Bouret is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of any global contract information associated with a service contract associated with a plurality of open API servers. Thus, the cited portion of Bouret must also fall to teach or suggest processing any such global contract information for a plurality of open API servers to determine local contract service terms for each of the open API servers, or that a proxy sends associated service contract implementation parameters to each of said open API servers based on said

Page 3

respective local contract service terms".

In response, Applicant is arguing the disclosure, not the claim limitations. Claimed subject matter, not the specification is the measure of the invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. See In re Self, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, 15 (CCPA 1978). The Examiner has a *duty* and *responsibility* to the public and to Applicant to interpret the claims *as broadly as reasonably possible* during prosecution (see *In re Prater, 56 CCPA 1381, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPQ 541 (1969)*).

It is noted that the features upon which Applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

VAN H. NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

an how ranger